

REMARKS**REGARDING THE CLAIMS AMENDMENTS**

Claims 1, 7, 10, 12, 13, have been amended to reference the addition of an acid.
The basis for this amendment may be found at page 9, lines 5-6.

ARGUMENTS

Rejection under 35 USC §102 over Kuhm et al. (US Patent No. 5,645,811):

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1-11 of the present application as being anticipated by Kuhm et al (US Patent No. 5, 645,811). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1 now has a step of adding a mineral acid with the source of aluminum:

1. A process for enhancing the yield of molecular sieve zeolite during the synthesis from a sodium aluminosilicate reaction mixture, said process comprising the step of **adding at an intermediate stage of crystallization a source of aluminum and an acid to the sodium aluminosilicate reaction mixture** and allowing the mixture to crystallize, wherein the adding of the source of aluminum serves to make up for the aluminum deficiency arising in the sodium aluminosilicate reaction mixture during crystallization.

The step of adding a mineral acid is not found in the Kuhm reference. It follows that the claims of the present application cannot be anticipated by Kuhm as it lacks this element of the claims. The Applicants respectfully assert that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance under 35 USC §102 over Kuhm.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

Claims 12-20 stand as rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuhm et al. (US 5,645,811) in view of Dwyer et al. (US 4,818,509).

The Examiner indicates that claims 12 to 20 of the present invention are unpatentable over Kuhm et al. in view of Dwyer et al. The Applicants respectfully traverse this objection as follows.

Please note that Claim 12 has also been amended in parallel with Claim 1. Claim 12 now reads:

12. A process for enhancing yield of molecular sieve zeolite during synthesis from a

sodium aluminosilicate reaction mixture, said process comprising steps of:

- (a) preparing a sodium aluminosilicate seed mixture;
- (b) preparing a sodium aluminosilicate gel reaction mixture;
- (c) adding the seed mixture of step (a) to the gel reaction mixture of step (b) to obtain molecular sieve precursor mixture;
- (d) heating the molecular sieve precursor mixture to a temperature sufficient for crystallization to occur;
- (e) **adding a source of aluminum and an acid to the molecular sieve precursor mixture at an intermediate stage of crystallization**, wherein the molecular sieve precursor mixture is depleted of aluminum and enriched in soda and silica at the intermediate stage wherein the adding of the source of aluminum serves to make up for the aluminum deficiency arising in the molecular sieve precursor mixture during crystallization, and
- (f) crystallizing molecular sieve zeolite product, recovering of crystallized product by filtration; washing the same with hot demineralized water to obtain molecular sieve zeolite with pH below 9.

As already argued in regard to the §102 rejection, Kuhm does not teach nor suggest the step of adding a mineral acid at an intermediated stage of crystallization with a source of aluminum. The addition of a mineral acid has the effect of increasing yield as compared to an otherwise similar process that does not include the addition of mineral acid.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to Examples 2, 3, and 5. Example 2 is a reference experiment. Example 3 is an example of the invention, but lacking the additional of a mineral acid with the source of aluminum. Example 5 is an example of the invention including a step of adding the mineral acid with the source of aluminum. Example 3 shows an increase yield of 19.8% as compared to Example 2. Example 5 shows an increase in yield of 31.53 percent, a yield improvement of more than 59 percent relative to the Example 3! Clearly this is a surprising result.


Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that none of the documents cited by the Examiner either taken independently or in combination teach or suggest all the limitations of the presently claimed invention. In view of the above, it is the Applicants' position that the claims of the present invention are not obvious in view of the Examiner's references.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the application is in a condition for allowance. No fee is believed due for this paper. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **13-0010 (KSP-1002US)**.

Respectfully submitted,


Dated: January 30, 2006



Gene L. Tyler
Registration No. 35,395
Madan, Mossman & Sriram, P.C.
2603 Augusta, Suite 700
Houston, Texas 77057
Telephone: (713) 266-1130
Facsimile: (713) 266-8510

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I do hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile, to the Commissioner for Patents, Examiner David R. Sample, facsimile no. (703) 872-9306, on this 30th day of January 2006.


Beth Naul.